REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 were rejected by the Office Action of July 13, 2005. Reconsideration of the Claim rejections is requested in view of the Claims amendments, Examiner Interview and following Remarks.

Independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are amended to more clearly recite Applicants novel invention. Additionally, in canceling claims 4 and 12, Applicants amend claims 5-6 and 13-14 to depend on a pending claim rather than to depend on a claim that is canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goto (U.S. 6,552,456) in view of Takahasi (U.S. 2003/0123763). Applicants traverse the claims rejection to show that obviousness is not established. Features of Applicants claimed invention are not taught or suggested by the references either individually or combined. Further, there is no suggestion or motivation either in the references or in knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the references or combine the references.

Applicants Claimed Invention

Applicants invention is directed in part at providing reduction or minimization of adhesive and abrasive wear for bearing surfaces in spindle motors. In an embodiment, a silicon containing copper alloy is utilized for at least one relatively rotating surface. In Applicants independent claims, as amended, at least one of the stationary component and the rotatable component is substantially comprised of silicon bronze. (see Applicants Independent claims 1, 9 and 17 as amended).

Further, Applicants conducted component level accelerated material wear tests (adhesive and abrasive), as illustrated in FIG. 5. Applicants further discovered that interface materials having complementary tribological properties may be utilized, as in the case wherein stainless steel is utilized for an adjacent surface to silicon bronze.

Cited References: Goto and Takahasi

The cited references either individually or combined do not teach or suggest Applicants claimed invention, in particular Applicants independent claims 1, 9 and 17.

Goto is cited by the Office Action for disclosing a disc drive storage system. However, in contrast to Applicants invention claiming a wear resilient surface and interface,
Goto describes:

> "...the flange section of the rotational shaft contacts **preselected** inner surface portions of the sleeve and the cover member while the shaft section of the rotational shaft does **not contact** any portion of the sleeve and an inner peripheral surface of the cover member" (Goto, Abstract, emphasis added).

Takahashi is cited by the Office Action for disclosing silicon containing copper alloy for the stationary or rotatable component. Additionally, the Office Action states that in regard to claims 4 and 12, the combination of Goto and Takahashi disclose silicon containing copper alloy is silicon bronze. Applicants respectfully disagree. Takahashi utilizes brass. The word "bronze" is not even stated in Takahashi, per Applicants word search.

Takahashi teaches away from utilizing bronze, as Takahashi describes the copper alloy as a **brass**:

> "...the material of sleeve is set to a copper alloy which contains a brass composed essentially of copper (Cu) and zinc (Zn), and silicon (Si), and which does not contain a low-melting soft metal component." (Takahashi, Abstract) (see also pg. 2, par. 25).

Further in contrast to Applicants invention, Takahashi describes a matrix form employing a spatial composition:

> "A hard phase consisting of a compound of brass and silicon, and a soft phase consisting of α brass are mixedly present in a matrix form." (Takahashi, Abstract).

In contrast, Applicants employ relatively low cost and commercially available materials, not requiring a matrix hard and soft mixture as taught in Takahashi.

Dependent Claims 2-3, 5-8, 10-11, 13-16 and 18-23

It is submitted that Applicants dependent claims 2-3, 5-8, 10-11, 13-16 and 18-23 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with regard to the independent claims. Further, Applicants dependent claims recite further features and combinations of features that are patentably distinct and not taught or suggested by Goto and Takahashi even as combined.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-23 as amended patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Additionally, Applicants request that, upon the allowance of a generic claim, the conical shaft and conical sleeve limitations of original claims 2, 10 and 18 be reinstated and written in dependent form to include all the limitation of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.142. These "conical" limitations were withdrawn from original claims 2, 10 and 18 due to a previous election required under 35 U.S.C. 121.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, please contact the undersigned at Tel. (310) 312-1500.

Respectfully submitted,
THE WAX LAW GROUP

Dated: Oct. 7, 2005

By:

Jeffrey S. Wax
Reg. No. 51,364
Tel. (310) 312-1500

Jeffrey S. Wax
Wax Law Group
2118 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 407
Santa Monica, California 90403

Tel. (310) 312-1500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 7, 2005.

Wilson October 7. 2005

Virginia Wilson *October 7, 2005*